My dictionary defines empirical as meaning capable of being verified or disproved by observation or experimentation. Much empirical evidence is not statistical and the Commission should not be ignoring such observational evidence.

Fourth, I believe that at least some members of the Commission and staff have placed an undue emphasis on searching for elusive formulae. Commission has been created as an expert agency predictive Congress expects it to make judgments. In calling for you to exercise this broad necessarily subjective discretion, and I'm not offering an excuse to justify a result that I seek. Indeed, such predictive judgments can and have been used over the last 20 years to deregulate more often than they've been used to regulate.

Fifth, and not withstanding what I've just said, the civic, consumer, labor and civil rights groups that have filed in this docket have submitted powerful and detailed statistical evidence which strongly supports retaining existing rules. They've also pointed to shortcomings in the study the Commission has generated and unlike the broadcasting industry, they have also responded to the Commission's request for metrics which can be employed to measure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

concentration. While such formulae should be one of 1 factors the Commission should consider, my 2 many 3 colleagues have presented a scheme based on developing a weighted HHI index which would be a significant 4 5 improvement over the traditional HHI employed in other economic sectors and I urge you to consider it. 6 7 Finally, with respect to what's been said about Telemundo and NBC's concern that the ownership 8 cap is holding it down, I think the answer here is 9 waivers and I'll be happy to sit down with Mr. Ireland 10 11 and Ms. Thompson. If they want to have a waiver of the national ownership cap for second 12 language programming, that's a perfectly legitimate public 13 14 interest justification to present as a waiver, but 15 it's not a reason to throw the baby out with the 16 bathwater. Thank you. 17 (Applause.) 18 19 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. Ms. Thompson? 20 MS. THOMPSON: Buenos dias. 21 It's a great honor for me to have the opportunity to address such a 22 distinguished Commission and audience. 23 I am here 24 representing ZGS Broadcast Holdings which is 25 minority-owned broadcasting company.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

E pluribus unum. The strength of this great nation is founded upon the principle of e pluribus unum, out of many, one. The intrinsic value of this coin reflects the progress of this nation throughout history, a prosperity that is clearly rooted in the diversity of its people and consequently of its business community.

The Hispanic community has grown to become the largest minority group in this country. However, Hispanic participation and representation in the broadcasting industry continues to decline, which is both a concern for our community and a concern from a public policy perspective.

I am here today to express unequivocally the importance of protecting and promoting minority representation in the broadcasting industry. As the Federal Communications Commission considers changes in the current ownership rules, it is my sincere hope that it will not allow conciliation and survival of the biggest to do away with the small and community rooted broadcasters that offer a unique service to the public. On the contrary, it will be my hope that the Commission looks to create and ensure opportunities for small and minority broadcasters to thrive and prosper into the future.

#### **NEALR, GROSS**

1 Fifteen Ronald years Gordon. ago, President and owner of our company, ZGS Broadcasting 2 3 Holdings, had the vision and commitment to see that 4 the Hispanic market will someday become a strong and 5 prosperous business opportunity. Born and raised in Peru, Mr. Gordon embraced his Hispanic roots and the 6 7 potential in serving a community that very few people knew, valued or cared to serve. His pursuit of the 8 9 American dream -- in Spanish broadcasting -- was an incredible, difficult and challenging task. 10 viable financial option was low power television and 11 12 given the limitations and secondary nature of the LPTV 13 service, no financial institution was willing to back Ultimately, not surprising, it was a Hispanic 14 him. 15 run bank that provided him the funds to acquire ZGS' first station. He risked and personally guaranteed 16 his assets in order to offer our growing community a 17 television station it could call its own. Since then, 18 ZGS' commitment to higher standards and service to the 19 Hispanic community have allowed the company to grow 20 into the largest affiliate of the Telemundo network 21 with LPTV Class A stations in Boston, Hartford, 22 23 Springfield, Providence, Orlando, Tampa along with radio properties 24 Washington, D.C., 25 Washington, D.C. and Tampa.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

and

1

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Today, ZGS Broadcast Holdings has over 160

employees of which 90 percent are of Hispanic descent.

My station, WCDC, has over 25 employees and each one

has an unwavering commitment to serve our

audience. Through our local news and Washington's

only Spanish-language public affairs program, Linea

Directa, the Hispanic community in this area is kept

informed of core issues. We are the community's only

vehicle to learn about the services and opportunities

available in our region. That is why we devote so

much effort to our educational projects such as our

Read to Succeed literacy campaign, the focus is on the

importance of literacy and scholastic achievement for

the success of our community.

We are very proud to be a Hispanic-owned

broadcaster and prouder still of the difference we

make in our communities. Our motto says it all, La

Voz de la Comunidad, the Voice of the Community.

There are several initiatives that the

Commission can consider to encourage and promote

diversity in broadcasting. As community broadcasters,

we can appreciate the opportunity that an enhanced

LPTV service can offer smaller broadcasters and I

would encourage the Commission to review how the

coverage and the status of this television service can

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

be improved and solidified.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

25

Class A was a critical addition for community broadcasters which allow many small and minority players to stay in the game. ZGS' stations are all Class A and as you have just heard, we do more in our communities than many full power stations across the country. Our business is not just about dollars and cents. We would like to think that it represents more public value and better use of the public airways than home shopping.

But Class A is simply not enough. Like all broadcasters, small community broadcasters need access to distribution, cable distribution. As Class A stations, we have to comply not only with all the regulatory requirements of full power stations that provide local programming, which full power stations do not need to do. Bigger is not necessarily better and my hope is that the Commission will consider providing Class A community stations which provide service with content and local privileges accorded to full power stations, especially [in Spanish.]

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. KRATTENMAKER: That concludes the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 panel's remarks. Technically, we have run out of time, but people have done an excellent job of staying within this timeframe, but it's obvious that I'm sure the Commissioners have many questions they want to ask, so why don't we begin with the Commissioners.

Commissioner Adelstein?

COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Krattenmaker.

Mr. Ireland from NBC, I have a question for you, and Mr. Schwartzman, maybe if you could respond as well.

You raised a very interesting point. You said the internet can serve, allow people to become their own programmer or editor. You'll be happy to know that my staff person gets her weather from NBC4 in Washington, D.C. When she doesn't have the opportunity to get it on television though, guess where she goes? She goes to your NBC4 website. So you win in both cases.

The question is she doesn't go to the National Weather Service and do her own forecast. Similarly, today's hearing for example, I doubt many people are going to go to the web and look at all the testimony, read all the testimony. The vast bulk of people that hear the story at all, are going to get it

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

on the <u>Washinston Post</u> website or on the website of their local newspaper or in their newspaper itself. They're not going to want to process and be their own programmer or editor, as much as they might like to.

So my question is for you, first of all, isn't a lot of what people get over the internet on major sources that are already owned by the major corporations in America and do people really want to be their own editor or programmer? Does the internet really function as a substitute for programming that they get on their news sources?

MR. IRELAND: Well, I believe that the internet does provide a varied amount of access to people to a lot of information. Yes, we do have a website that ties into our television station, but it pales in comparison from the standpoint of what The Washington Post gets and what the Weather Channel might get for someone to check weather.

There's also many national news services available, as well as information from just knowledge or whatever people may want to look at.

There's no way that we can direct the users of the internet to our sites. They have the complete flexibility to cruise. They can google, they can do whatever they want to try to figure out how to

2 1

1	get to a site. We hope that they come to our sites
2	because we have compelling content. We address their
3	local issues. We address what their concerns might be
4	around some areas that we deal in.
5	We obviously cannot be everything to
6	everybody, but at least in that specific example,
7	again, the people have the power of choice and we just
8	hope that as they go through that we're able to
9	provide them an alternative for them to choose from.
10	MR. SCHWARTZMAN: The short answer is that
11	the internet has yet to become and may never become a
12	significant source <b>of</b> original, local content about
13	news and information. Virtually all of the locally
14	generated information available on the internet is
15	recycled from local newspaper and broadcast properties
16	who have leveraged their incumbent status. In fact,
17	the three sites just mentioned, <u>Washington Post</u> , NBC4
18	and Weather Channel which is Discovery Communications,
19	excuse me, Landmark Communications, are all major
20	media operators.
2 1	The Commission's own data about
22	[END TAPE 1, SIDE B; BEGIN TAPE 2, SIDE
23	A.]
24	reached the conclusion that internet

and other sources are not effective substitutes.

Professor Owens' study is particularly egregious in failing to take that into account. Even using a .1 level of statistical significant, the Waldfogel (Phonetic) study shows almost no substitution. The short way to view it is as follows: when somebody wants to get elected to public office, do they buy internet banner ads or television ads? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN POWELL: I'd like to ask a more general question that I think underlies all of that and by the way I would note that a major Democratic Presidential candidate has announced that his Presidential Office is on the internet. It suggests that the internet may not be there yet, but is certainly maturing as a source of political discourse or you wouldn't have a Presidential candidate using it so extensively.

I also would note that where most people go to get their weather is the Weather Channel which isn't one of the dominant ones being alluded to so frequently.

Ι think one of the things difficult for us and I think difficult for all of you is when is popularity dominant and not just popularity? talk a great deal We about attention to what consumers want, but half the time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

what we're railing against is what consumers chose.

Mr. Bozell, I have two young children and I care a lot about what they watch on TV. stand there with a baseball bat, but certainly pay attention to what they see. But I don't know how to dismiss as a government official the fact that there may be a class of programming to which a vast majority of individual American citizens prefer to watch and it may not be the programming that I would choose for my child to see or may not be the programming that certain groups would prefer to see, but there is an element of the public interest that is what interests the public. And I've often heard and I respect the argument there should be some concern about our culture and our society, but difficult to quantify as a matter of governmental action when you're going to take steps to go beyond what it is the public itself responds to.

So we can be disparaging of that. We can call it sludge, but it's the sludge people are watching. We could call it dominance, but it's the quality choices that people are making. And where I've always struggled with this is how does government distinguish between what ought to be the rights of individual citizens to watch what they choose, not

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

what the government would prefer that they see.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

25

And so help us with that basic underlying tenet. When is it not what interests the public, but it's something that either your group or someone else thinks they would be better served to see?

That's a good question, Mr. MR. BOZELL: Chairman, and I'm not sure that there is an easy answer to that question. However, I would submit to you that when you've got a handful of corporations controlling two thirds of the access of the programs of the networks that are out there, then what they determine is going to go on television is what can by itself determine what the market wants. the market, as this lady, I don't recall her name, makes the point dramatically, when the public getting a certain message, a certain kind of program, a certain value system, and is being hammered with it and hammered with it and hammered with it and all the other voices are never presented well, ultimately, there is going to be a significant part of that market that is going to accept that message and want more of it but has no idea that there are other messages.

I talk to people who are in the industry who are producers, writers, primarily who are

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	attempting to come out with product and they feel like
2	they're bashing their head against the wall because
3	there's nowhere to go because the corporate mentality
4	of these major corporations is just simply not
5	interested in that voice in that kind <b>of</b> programming.
6	And so it never gets <b>out</b> to the public. So in the
7	final analysis, how do we know what the market wants?
8	MR. KRATTENMAKER: I don't know which is
9	the best way to go, but maybe we'll just work down and
10	we'll talk to Mr. Copps.
11	COMMISSIONER COPPS: Mr. Bozell, you just
12	testified that we're in the midst of a tremendous
13	consolidation in the media and you almost never
14	advocate government intervention on something like
15	ownership. You see a problem here. And you said that
16	your 750,000 members believe that television and radio
17	and other media have taken a sharp turn for the worse
18	in recent years as extreme violence and trashy
19	programming has become more and more endemic, creating
20	risks for our children.
21	Do you believe that it's important that
22	the FCC take the issue of the declining quality of
23	media programming into account in this proceeding on
24	media ownership?

MR. BOZELL: Perhaps I would tell you that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

of the many different things I've observed in my lifetime professionally, I have never in my life seen a more passionate outpouring of concern from the public than over this one issue.

COMMISSIONER COPPS: And do you believe that the FCC has taken this subject seriously?

MR. BOZELL: I do not. When no one has been fined on television for indecent programming, I've got to conclude that the FCC doesn't believe there's anything indecent on television. But I don't think you would ever allow me to say right here in this hearing some of the language that was used last night on television to your children.

COMMISSIONER COPPS: Is there in your mind a correlation between the rising tide of consolidation and the rising tide of indecent programming even if we don't know for sure yet if there's a causal link?

MR. BOZELL: I have to be very careful. We have to be very careful. I think we do not want to ascribe a blame where blame ought not to be going. I do not believe there's a conspiracy going on here. I do not believe there are bad people in these corporations. However, the reality is that in the last several years and every study we've done and it's never been questioned shows that it is getting worse

2 1

1 and worse and worse when it comes to programming and you're seeing more and more and more consolidation. 2 3 COMMISSIONER COPPS: Do you think it would be irresponsible for the FCC to decide to scrap or 4 5 significantly modify our concentration rules that might lead to even more indecency without adequately 6 7 exploring this possible correlation? 8 MR. BOZELL: For the reasons I've given, 9 yes. COMMISSIONER COPPS: You mentioned you 10 have 750,000 members who are extremely concerned with 11 12 violence and other forms of indecency in the media, but that they do not even know that the FCC is making 13 this decision, correct? 14 MR. BOZELL: Absolutely. 15 COMMISSIONER COPPS: So it sounds like 16 this issue is not an inside the beltway issue, but 17 probably millions and millions of Americans 18 19 concerned, but don't even know that they should make their voice heard, right? 20 MR. BOZELL: Absolutely. 21 COMMISSIONER COPPS: 22 So I guess before we're through, we're going to have to add a few to our 23 18,000 comments if Americans really find out what's 24 25 going on here. Don't you agree?

I hope you will. I hope that indecency and the Commission's role in that will 2 3 become more important than I believe it has been to 4 date. 5 COMMISSIONER COPPS: Thank you very much. 6 MR KRATTENMAKER: Mr. Chairman, could I 7 just ask before we leave, because I think all of us 8 have so many questions. Is there a possibility that we could submit some written questions. We don't want 9 to inundate our panelists, but just to flesh out the 10 record and then to ensure that these are part of the 11 12 record in the proceedings. CHAIRMAN POWELL: Sure. In fact, I've got 13 14 a whole stack of questions from the audience too so 15 we'll figure out how to do that. If you don't mind, I'd like to follow up a 16 17 little on Commissioner Copps and ask Ms. 18 whether she agrees with the responses to his questions that Mr. Bozell provided? 19 I'd like you to know that I 20 MS. RISKIN: have black and blue marks on my head from pounding on 21 22 the network doors. I think many of our members feel 23 frustrated. They would like do quality to 24 programming, but find themselves in a situation where in order to do work with the networks they have to 25

MR. BOZELL:

cede complete control which means that if they want to do a story about a middle-aged person, take for example, a show called "The Cornish." I don't know if you remember, it wasn't about FCC Commissioners, it was another kind of Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN POWELL: That's probably why it didn't work.

MS. RISKIN: Actually, it was quite a good show and the man who created the show insisted on a middle-aged sort of pork bellied lead character. The network demanded that it be a young, handsome Italian and in those days when this show was created, the creator of the show simply went to another network. He could shop his story somewhere else. That does not exist today.

I think that the urgency for ratings and bottom line has chased away a majority of good audience for quality programming in the marketplace.

We used to have a very rich marketplace for movies for television. If you remember "The Autobiography of Miss Jane Pittman" or "Roots." You don't see those programs today on the networks. They are being done in-house. They are expensive for a major corporation to make. They are not expensive, they are not problematic in terms of making money for

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

a small company that's backed by somebody with a passion to tell  ${\bf a}$  story.

So we have chased out of the marketplace people who are important story tellers with the kind of quality programming that Brent Bozell would like to see returned.

Just as an added note, one of the executives at ABC was asked why the new series last year, the majority of the pilots were developed by their own in-house production. And the answer was because they wanted all their programs to have the ABC brand or stamp which means that all those shows would be coming from one point of view. This is what's damaging the diversity in the marketplace. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN POWELL: Thank you and we will provide an opportunity for Mr. Ireland to respond, but I think we should first see what Commissioner Abernathy and Commissioner Martin wanted to follow up on.

Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: Thank you. I still come back to the dilemma that I think as government regulators we face which is there's been a lot of concern expressed that the programming is really rotten, there's not a lot of choice about it.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Forget if we change the rules at all. It sounds like this is a general comment about programming today as we see it today.

And yet, you also tell me that five have 75 percent share of prime time viewing. So there are all these alternative channels. There's the Discovery Channel. There's Children's Channel. There's AMC. There's Biography. There's History. And people aren't watching it, apparently. Apparently 75 percent are watching prime time viewing which then goes back to do I tell them they can't watch this? Do I start trying to force them into these other outlets? Which are there, apparently, but it looks to me like most people are choosing to watch the 75 percent prime time viewing. So I'd like anyone to comment on that.

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Mr. Schwartzman?

MR. SCHWARTZMAN: Yes, Commissioner. Two points on this. First, this is not just about majority tastes. The market will take care of majority tastes. The Commission'sjob as Congress has reminded it in the case of children's television is that where the market fails, the Commission can and should and has the power 'and authority to direct broadcasters to carry certain kinds of content that's a viewpoint neutral content --

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: Do you believe
2	the market is failing today? That's what I need to
3	know.
4	MR. SCHWARTZMAN: Absolutely.
5	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: So there's not
6	enough choices
7	MR. SCHWARTZMAN: The market
8	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: People can't turn
9	to history or to American Movie Classics or to PBS?
10	MR. SCHWARTZMAN: You buy circulation and
11	you buy viewers and when you have huge conglomerates
12	which are also the ones programming most channels, and
13	they are leveraging their incumbent status to drive
14	the other content, you don't get the development of
15	programming which serves these different additional
16	tastes and you lose the creative juice. You deplete
17	the creative gene pool by reducing the number of
18	channels for creative people to introduce their
19	programming. This is what happens with concentration
20	of control. You get concentration of taste.
2 1	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: So are you
22	discounting, then you must be discounting cable. Are
23	you just talking about free over-the-air?
24	MR. SCHWARTZMAN: No, no. Who owns the
25	cable channels?

1	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: No, but what's on
2	the cable channels that people aren't watching.
3	That's where I keep they can turn the channel.
4	MR. SCHWARTZMAN: Some people are watching
5	it, but you've got the large companies using their
6	powers under the retransmission consent and so
7	forth, to drive viewers to their own content which
8	they're repurposing and the size of these companies
9	and their promotional capabilities make leave
10	viewers unaware of what else is there. This is buying
11	circulation
12	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: So that's what
13	you'd okay. Now I get what you're saying. You're
14	saying it's the promotional capabilities so people
15	don't realize they have a choice.
16	MR. SCHWARTZMAN: Incumbents leverage
17	their power. That's the most important thing that ${f I}$
18	would say.
19	The second point that I would well, I'm
20	taking too much time. Let me leave it at that.
2 1	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: Let me hear what
22	Bob's response would be.
23	MR. CORN-REVERE: Well, as usual, when I
24	hear Andy speak I feel we're on different planets.
25	It's just hard to imagine that people can talk about

less choice and less diversity today than at any time in our history. You can talk about the number of owners all you want, but the fact is the average viewer has a myriad of choices that never existed before. And people don't have a hard time finding PBS if they want to find it. And they don't have a hard time finding Discovery Science or Biography or any of the other channels, the History Channel. They can find them and the question is whether they want to find them.

But I think this whole colloquy that's been going on underscores the danger of trying to use structural rules to engage in social engineering. There's a serious mismatch going on here because when the Hollywood community talks about creative control and wanting to put on quality programs, they're talking about wanting to put on the very kinds of programs that Mr. Bozell hates. For example, if you look at the comments filed in this proceeding, they talk about being blocked from being able to put on shows like "Murphy Brown" and "Roseanne", shows that Mr. Bozell in the past has criticized and I'm sure would again if they reappeared.

The other difficulty is when you start talking about using official pressure to change the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

kinds of programs that appear on television, then it's hard to predict what's going to happen. If you go back 10 or 12 years ago when "The Simpsons" first appeared on Fox which, by the way, at the time was a fledgling network and wasn't forcing anybody to watch anything. "The Simpsons" appeared and was roundly criticized as being vulgar and in poor taste. President George Bush criticized it by saying that we needed a nation closer to the Waltons than to the I guess he didn't have quite the same concern with bland TV.

Drug czar William Bennett engaged in a similar public tirade against "The Simpsons". And Mr. Bozell criticized it in a 1997 column saying that it is "a dysfunctional family" and I believe the same concern you had today about the Hollywood elites forcing their views. You say always the approach is the same. Forget the majority sentiment, aim to capture the avant garde minority.

Well, I think if you come back now and look at a program like "The Simpsons" it's clearly stood the test of time. It's the longest running sitcom in TV history. National Review recently called it possibly the most intelligent, funny and politically satisfying TV show ever. Broadcasting and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 <u>Cable</u> has editorialized in favor of giving it an Emmy 2 and not just as an animated series. And lately, and 3 perhaps surprisingly, religious writers have begun praising "The Simpsons" for the amount of religious 4 5 content in the show including a recent book that's come out on the subject. There are even websites 6 7 devoted to the religious references in "The Simpsons." 8 So I think once you start having public 9 officials put their thumb on the scale and try and create structural rules to affect whether or not shows 10 like that are going to succeed or to game the process, 11 12 then I think you have a very serious problem. MR KRATTENMAKER: Commissioner Martin? 13 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Mr. Bozell, you said 14 that you'd never seen an outpouring like this one on 15 16 this issue. Just help me understand. I was just 17 trying to -- is the issue that you're seeing the outpouring on the decency or indecency the 18 programming or is it on the ownership issues? 19 20 And I'm trying to understand what you're actually seeing the outpouring of public comment on 2 1 and I'm still a little confused about the connection 22 between the two. And then I would hope that maybe Mr. 23 Corn-Revere could respond as well to your comments. 24 MR. 25 BOZELL: I'd be happy to respond.

First, let me, in fact, and correct Mr. Corn-Revere and I would ask him not to quote out of context what I have and haven't said. I've also praised "The Simpsons" up and down for a thousand different reasons as well. And we're not debating -- we could debate it some other time, but please don't take my words out of context.

On the question of what the public talks about, I travel all over the country. Ladies and gentlemen, you do the same thing. You talk to people. You talk to your friends, you talk to your associates. And on a daily basis, there isn't somebody who isn't going to say to you did you see what was on television last night? Did you see -- and I'm not going to name any shows because it's unfair to pinpoint a show. did you see this show? Did you see that program? you hear what he said on that awards program? hear the F word used last night during the family They're horrified that this is happening. hour? They're horrified that it's happening with increasing frequency. And then they say what can I do? What can one do about this?

We are the market. We are the public out there. Look at the national surveys. Ninety-seven percent of families in this country believe there's

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

too much sex and violence on prime time television coming into their living rooms, being broadcast to their children. And then they turn and say what can I do about it?

Well, they go to the networks. The networks tell them go pound sand. They don't care. They've got the longevity to withstand any little complaint and they keep it up long enough and sooner or later as Mr. Corn-Revere just said, people start accepting it. And they just resign themselves that that's the way it's going to be. And that's another wall that's just come down. Another sensibility that's been taken care of.

There's got to be a politics of shame, I believe. Not just, by the way on the end stream. Not just on the Commission, on the advertisers and on the public as well. This is a very complicated issue, but there's got to be standards. We've got to say to ourselves, we can't put certain messages on license plates. You can't do that. You can't use the N word on a license plate and go down the road with it. You will go to prison or something for that. You can't put certain signs on billboards, but why can you put it on television in front of my children and why is it that it's indecent, uncivilized for me to use certain

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 language in this hearing, but tonight on television it will go to my children. And it's okay? 2 3 There's a problem. 4 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: I was wondering if 5 Mr. Corn-Revere -- just a comment about -- is the problem the connection between, or whether there is a 6 7 connection between, indecency and the ownership 8 issues, which is really what is before the Commission. 9 MR. CORN-REVERE: Well, I understand the concerns expressed about indecency, but I just don't 10 11 understand the connection you're trying to draw between that and media concentration. 12 13 In fact, again, when you start talking 14 about the different views on this panel, you see very 15 divergent views. A while ago, Ms. Riskin referred to the situation that Stephen J. Cannell had in trying to 16 17 solve "The Comish" and in the same article that 18 Cannell was writing about that situation, he described 19 another producer being turned down when he took "The Sopranos" to network television and saying that the 20 21 networks just didn't get it and none of the networks 22 bought it and so in the end the producer was forced to 23 to HBO and ultimately reform the shape 24 television. 25 Now there are two points that I think that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

are important from that anecdote that comes from the article in last week's <u>Broadcasting and Cable</u> by Stephen J. Cannell. The first is that it doesn't see like diversity has been harmed when the networks make a mistake on whether or not to get a show and it turns up someplace else.

And the second **is** I don't think "the Sopranos" is what Mr. Bozell had in mind what he wants to limit concentration so that we have more quality television.

It has been one of those shows, it's been a breakthrough show. It's been praised by many, reviled by others because it is a hard edged show. It is on cable and it's forcing the networks now to compete, but again, I don't see the problem with concentration. The problem, if there is one, is that the networks are being forced to compete.

CHAIRMAN POWELL: Thank you. One of the things I find interesting is even if I credit your argument about indecency, and I think there's a fair amount of it that's fair commentary about aspects of finding it bit television, I'm а strange the connection to the concentration because I suppose you will be told that the clean era of the 1950s or 1960s is when TV was of the quality that we preferred when

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

there were three networks. So tying it to concentration, there was never a time in history where the media was more concentrated and the period where TV was probably its cleanest. So I don't know that I see the immediate merits of the suggestions that the concentration levels of today are somehow responsible for indecency.

I'd only also like to make probably just a personal comment. I think TV right now produces some of the worst ever and I also think it produces some of the best ever. I think what's happened is TV has dramatically increased in abundance. Yes, I do have a lot of neighbors say did you see that terrible show last night? I also have a lot that come in and say did you see the Theodore Roosevelt special, it was brilliant. I also had people come to see me and say did you see Ken Burns' Civil War special? It was brilliant.

Every afternoon after Wednesday, my office comes in and says did you see "West Wing" last night? Wasn't that amazing? Or Fox's "24" or I think one of the challenges we all are going to have with citizens as the media continues to explode you're going to have a wider range of diversities in the marketplace from the most shameless to the greatest.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Υ

But this connection to concentration, I find, to be almost fabricated.

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Mr. Chairman, can I treat that as a comment? I think I might do that. We've already cut deeply into the public comment time and I would like to get to that. I'm going to cut into it a little bit more by saying that with all the cards I've gotten, there's a series of questions that aren't being asked here yet that I'd at least like to pose briefly, particularly to Ms. Thompson and to Mr. Liggins. I don't know whether Mr. Ireland would like to comment on it and it is summarizing two or three of these.

So far talking we've been almost exclusively about television, what about radio? perhaps little bit more specifically what reminded of the old joke that there are three kinds of lies, lies, damn lies and statistics, but are there certain kinds of ways that the Commission may have of knowing how it is that increased diversity ownership can lead to diversity of public service activity and diversity of programming?

It seemed like Mr. Liggins had, you may want to say you've already addressed that, but I don't know whether you want to follow up with that a little

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

bit or Ms. Thompson?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. LIGGINS: I'd certainly like At least from our perspective, we've been the consolidated of African-American oriented formats as we've gone in and bought more radio stations, competition is what drives the different voices of the different options in programming. you don't want to compete with yourself, so why would you launch a comparable product? You launch something NBC has launched Telemundo. different. In Atlanta, Georgia, we have a gospel FM station. That's -gospel has typically been relegated to the AM band for the last 50 years and in Atlanta on a very expensive station that we paid a lot of money for, we took a shot and you know what? It was very successful. the third highest rated radio station in that market.

We have a jazz station. We have a hip hop station. And we also have an R & B oldies station. So ironically enough, when we first went into the market, our first station was hip hop oriented and we got some barbs for that because hip hop music can at times be seen as aggressive. But the same company, Radio One, also has a station, a gospel station that is being praised. So the nature of competition, I think, forces the diversity in format options.

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	I also think the range and the spectrum of
2	some of the best television programming and some of
3	the worst that you've seen, that's what competition
4	also does. It forces people to take chances, whether
5	a television broadcaster or a radio broadcaster,
6	because you are fighting for the attention and the
7	ratings and the votes from the public. So you have to
8	take more shots in order to be successful.
9	And consolidation, I was against
10	consolidation prior to the 1996 act. I lobbied
11	against it, but when I saw that it was going to go the
12	direction that we and NABOB had wanted, we decided
13	that we needed to get in the game and to compete. And
14	it cost money in order to deliver "The Simpsons" and
15	it cost money in order to even deliver this gospel
16	radio station that I told you about.
17	So there is a necessariness to scale in
18	order to deliver quality programming that I think
19	needs to be underscored here.
20	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. Ms.
2 1	Thompson, did you wish to comment.
22	MS. THOMPSON: Well, you can certainly
23	sense the kind of pride when Mr. Liggins talks about
24	his company and the products that he provides to his
25	community and you can certainly also see that every

	110
1	product that he is outlining specifically targets the
2	segment of the community that he is serving and that's
3	exactly my point. I think minority-owned broadcasters
4	know how to serve their communities. And if we don't
5	provide support to those minority broadcasters, they
6	would not be able to continue in business, especially
7	with the issues of carriage. Distribution is the key
8	for us.
9	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. I think the
10	Commissioners should vote with their feet. We have a
11	number of people lined up to make public comments.
12	CHAIRMAN POWELL: We'll continue this
13	until 12:30 and we'll take a 30 minute lunch break.
14	We'll be back here at 1, but we have at least 20 some
15	odd minutes left to hear from the public. And also
16	some of the cards that you have, Tom.
17	Why don't we start with that process and
18	we'll go left and right, and Tom, please interject
19	with the questions that you have on the cards as we go
20	forward.
21	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Do we have a time
22	limit?
23	CHAIRMAN POWELL: 12:30 we're wrapping up.
24	MR. KRATTENMAKER: No, for each
25	individual

# **NEAL R. GROSS**